



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL II

NEW YORK, APRIL 24, 1909

NO 24

The Third Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States will be held at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., on Friday and Saturday, April 23-24, beginning on Friday at 2.30. Programmes, giving outlines of most of the papers, have been widely distributed throughout the territory covered by the Association, to members and to others, and a large attendance is expected. Those who intend to be present over night on Friday are requested to notify Mr. Franklin A. Dakin, The Haverford School, Haverford, Pa., that proper arrangements may be made for their comfort.

In Cicero Cat. 1. 23 we have the following interesting passage:

Sin autem servire meae laudi et gloriae mavis, egredere cum importuna sceleratorum manu, confer te ad Manlium, concita perditos cives, secerne te a bonis, infer patriae bellum, exsulta impio latrocinio, ut a me non eiectus ad alienos, sed invitatus ad tuos isse videaris.

I wish to direct attention especially to the words *ut a me . . . videaris*. In Professor Bennett's Latin Grammar (Revised Edition, 1908), § 282, 1. C we have the following statement: "*Ut non* (not *ne*) is used where the negation belongs to some single word, instead of to the purpose clause as a whole". In Gildersleeve-Lodge § 545, R. we read: "*Ut non* is used <in purpose clauses> when a particular word is negated". Both grammars refer to our passage, and to that alone, as proof of their respective statements. In the latest edition of Allen and Greenough, § 531. 1, N. 2, we have this: "*Ut non* sometimes occurs in clauses of purpose when *non* belongs to some particular word: as, *ut plura non dicam* (Manil. 44), to avoid unnecessary talk".

Let us consider first the passage from the first Catiline oration. As a matter of fact there is no true negation in this passage. The *ut* clause is a climax affirmative in spirit from beginning to end; hence *ut* is properly used for *ut*, and for nothing else; nothing else is possible. In the combination *non . . . sed*, the stress is always on the second phrase or clause, and the whole is affirmative, not negative. The thought can best be brought out by a paraphrase, *ut ad tuos invitatus potius quam ad alienos eiectus isse videaris*. Mark the difference

between the sentence before us and such a construction as that in Gellius 16. 10. 6 *Petimus igitur ne Annalem nunc Q. Ennii, sed duodecim tabulas legi arbitrere, et quid sit in ea lege proletarius civis interpretare*. Gellius could perfectly well have written *Petimus ut non Annalem . . . sed duodecim tabulas legi arbitrere*. No one would maintain that the two forms are identical. In the words that Gellius actually wrote the clause beginning with *ne* is at first negative, then positive in its general spirit; 'I beg you not to think . . . but to think'; hence we have *ne*. In the form involving *ut non . . . sed* the spirit is throughout, as said above, affirmative; hence we should have *ut*, nothing else. The negative particle is as fully independent of *ut* in this latter version as it is in such a construction as we find in Gellius 19. 8. 12 *Sed haec ego dixi, non ut huius sententiae legisque fundus subscriptorque fierem, sed ut ne Caesaris, viri docti, opinionem destituerem, or in Pliny Epp. 2. 6. 2 non ut potestas eligendi, sed ne ius esset recusandi*.

In the Catilinarian passage, then, *ut* and *non* do not in any sense belong together; any statement which unites them is inaccurate and misleading.

Nor is the statement in Allen and Greenough concerning Manil. 44, *ut plura non dicam*, any happier than that of Messrs. Bennett and Gildersleeve-Lodge concerning the Catilinarian passage. What we have here is a good example of the adherescent *non*, which corresponds to the adherescent *οὐ* seen e. g. in *οὐ φημι*. Another example of *non* so used occurs in Horace Epp. 1. 5. 21 ff. *Haec ego procurare . . . imperor . . . ne non et cantharus et lanx ostendat tibi te*.

With the passage in Cic. Cat. 1. 23 I would compare e. g. Cic. Cat. 1. 27 *Tunc eum . . . exire patiere, ut abs te non emissus ex urbe, sed immissus in urbem esse videatur*, Livy 21. 5. 3 in Olcadum prius fines . . . induxit exercitum, ut non petisse Saguntinos, sed rerum serie . . . tractus ad id bellum videri posset, and Cic. C. M. 36 *tantum cibi et potionis adhibendum ut reficiantur vires, non opprimantur*, a passage kindred to that which prompted this note (Professor Bennett, however, prefers to regard this clause as consecutive); we might easily write here *tantum . . . adhibendum ut non opprimantur sed reficiantur vires*. C. K.